



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,174	03/16/2006	Simon Jeremy East	357358.00003-US	5211

78905 7590 06/21/2010

Saul Ewing LLP (Philadelphia)
Attn: Patent Docket Clerk
Penn National Insurance Plaza
2 North Second St., 7th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101

EXAMINER

FAN, HUA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2456

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/21/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	<p>Application No. 10/572,174</p>	<p>Applicant(s) EAST ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner HUA FAN</p>	<p>Art Unit 2456</p>	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 10 June 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-16.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Rupal D. Dharia/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2400

11) Applicant's arguments have been fully considered by the examiner but they are not persuasive. Please refer to the Final Rejection for examiner's positions. Further, In response to the applicant's arguments, applicant argues in substance

A) (on page 4 with respect to claim 1) with respect to claim 1 that Chow does not teach "a log of data identifying content that has been viewed by a specific device".

The examiner disagrees. As cited by the examiner in the prior office action (dated 3/17/2010, page 4), Chow discloses such limitation, at col. 4, line 57 - col. 5, line 3, "when the user views the modified retrieved object, the form allows the user to specify whether this is an object of interest". Clearly, this content has been "viewed by the user", and the user further sends a log (the object of interest) to the Revision Manager to indicate interest of monitoring updates for the object.

B) (on page 5, paragraph 1) that Chow does not teach "remote computer identifying automatically without explicit user request any of that viewed content that has been updated".

The examiner disagrees. As cited and explained in the prior office action (dated 3/17/2010, page 5, paragraph 2), Chow discloses "Spontaneously updating of the cache when objects of interest have changed". This indicates that the remote computer identified any of that viewed content that has been updated without any explicit user request. It is to be noted that the claimed limitation is for "identifying...viewed content that has been updated", not for "identifying a list of content that is to be updated". The user's interaction in Chow is merely provide a list of content that is to be monitored. As to identify content that HAS BEEN UPDATED is spontaneously done without user's EXPLICIT request.

C) (on page 5, paragraphs 2-3) that Chow does not teach "automatically stored in device memory" because Chow's teaching of "shared cache" is not device memory.

The examiner disagrees. As cited in the prior office action (Dated 3/17/2010, page 5, paragraph 4), Chow discloses in col. 4, lines 25-39 that a local shared cache is provided for devices to gain access to the updated information. This shared cache is equivalent to "device memory". It is to be noted that the claimed limitation recites "device memory", it is not specified by the claimed limitation where exactly the memory resides.

D) (on page 6, paragraph 1) with respect to claim 16 that Chow does not teach "content that is being viewed by the device".

The examiner disagrees. As cited in the prior office action (dated 3/17/2010, page 9, paragraph 2), Chow at col. 5, lines 15-17) that such a log for interested objects previously accessed is sent. As is disclosed in the same paragraph, such log was created when the content is being viewed, see lines 2-3, "When the user views the modified retrieved object, the form allows the user to specify whether this is an object of interest".

All rejections set forth in the Final Rejection are maintained by the examiner. It is to be noted that the prosecution for this case has been closed.